KENNETH ROBERT NORMAN

AŚOKA'S THIRTEENTH ROCK EDICT

Introduction

Aśoka's Thirteenth Rock Edict is, to my knowledge, unique among royal inscriptions, of any age or culture, in that it includes a royal statement of repentance. Commenting on it, van Buitenen says[1]: "The so-called 13th rock edict – in which Aśoka, after the massacre of the Kaliṅgas (Western Orissa) abjures war – is the most moving document of any dynamic history".

From many points of view this edict is of considerable interest and importance, not least because of the fact that it does not occur at all sites where the series of Rock Edicts is inscribed. The edict is found at Kālsī, Yeṟṟagudi, Shāhbāzgaṟhi, Mānsehrā and Girnār[2], but

---

[1] J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN,, (et al.), "Arts of South Asian Peoples", in *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edition, Chicago, 1977, Vol. 17, p. 135.

[2] Abbreviations: AMg = Ardha-Māgadhī; Gk. = Greek; RE = Rock Edict; K = Kālsī; Y = Yeṟṟagudi; Sh = Shāhbāzgaṟhi; M = Mānsehrā; G = Girnār; Bloch = J. BLOCH, *Les inscriptions d'Aśoka*, Paris, 1950; Hultzsch = E. HULTZSCH, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Oxford, 1925; MW = M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899; CP = K. R. NORMAN, *Collected Papers* I-VI, Oxford 1990-96. When discussing the readings at various sites I normally list them in the order K, Y, Sh, M, G, for consistency – this has no implications about the closeness of any one particular version to Aśoka's original dictation. The abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are those adopted by *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (= CPD).

not at Dhauli, Jaugaḍa or Sannati, although the evidence at Sannati is inconclusive[3]. There is a Greek version of a portion of the edict. Although, because of its importance, much attention has been devoted to it, there are still many problems, and discussions of the edict are scattered through the pages of learned journals.

In this paper, offered in honour of Professor G.M. Bongard-Levin, I wish to give further consideration to this edict, including the Greek version where it helps to elucidate the Prakrit versions. I will give a sentence by sentence translation, with discussion of the philological aspects, concentrating upon points of difficulty. Limitations of space made it impracticable to include the complete texts of all the versions of the edict, and Hultzsch's edition must therefore be consulted when the notes are being read. For Yerraguḍi I follow the readings given in U. Niklas, *Die Editionen der Aśoka-inschriften von Erraguḍi*, Bonn, 1990. I make no comment upon words about whose meaning little discussion is needed. My interpretation of them can be deduced from the translation I give. I will conclude by making some general comments upon the edict.

Translation and commentary

[A][4] "By His Majesty Piyadassi, when consecrated eight years, the inhabitants of Kaliṅga were conquered".

(1) K *devānaṃpiyaṣa piyadaṣine* Y *devānaṃpiyasa piyadasine* Sh *devanapriasa priadraśisa* M *devanapriyasa priyadraśine*. These are genitive forms constructed with the past participle *vijita* in the sense of the instrumental; cf. note (6) in [E][5]. Note that Sh omits -*y*- in both words (cf. note (1) in [B] and note (3) in [X],

---

[3] K. R. NORMAN, "Aśokan inscriptions from Sannati", in *South Asian Studies* 7 (1991), pp.101-110 (= CP V, pp. 71-79), in part. p. 102.

[4] I adopt Hultzsch's sentence letters, and print them in square brackets.

[5] See C. CAILLAT, "The constructions "*mama kṛtam*" and "*mayā kṛtam*" in Aśoka's Edicts", in *Proceedings of the XXXII International Congress for Asian and North African Studies*, 1992, p. 489.

and contrast *priyasa* in [E]), and has the genitive ending *-isa* instead of *-ine, i.e.* the ending *-(s)sa* < Sanskrit *-sya* is added analogically to an *i(n)*-stem word.

(2) Following Benveniste[6] I take *piyadasi* to be the king's personal name (Πιοδάσσης in Gk.), and *devānaṃpiya* to be a title, comparable to English "His Majesty", and I use this as the translation of the title in this paper.

(3) Y *kaligā* K *kaligyā* Sh M *kaliga* G *kaliṃgā*. K *kaligyā* probably implies that there was no nasal in the word in the exemplar which the scribe received, and *-g-* was consequently palatalised > *-gy-*, in the same way that the change of *-k-* > *-ky-* is found with few exceptions at K (see note (6) in [G]). Note that *kaligya* occurs again at K in [C] and [D], but we find *kaliṃga* in [K]. The ending *-ā* is the nominative plural, and the word therefore means "the inhabitants of Kaliṅga". The Gk. version has the accusative Τὴν Καλίγγην, showing that the ending *-ā* of *kaliṃgā* was taken to be a feminine singular ending by the translator.

[B] "150,000 people were transported from there; 100,000 were killed there; nearly as many died".

(1) KYM *diyadha* Sh *diadha*, "1$^1/_2$" < Sanskrit *dvyardha*. Sh omits *-y-*; cf. note (1) in [A]. It is uncertain whether *diyaḍḍha* should be interpreted as showing a glide *-y-* between *di* and *aḍḍha, i.e.* *di-y-aḍḍha*, or as *diy-aḍḍha* < **dv^{i}y-ardha, i.e.* *dvyardha* with a svarabhakti vowel evolved in the conjunct *-vy-*.

(2) K Y *mite* Sh M *matre*. At K Hultzsch and Bloch read *māta*, where *-ā* probably represents an incomplete *-i* (cf. *maṃñāsara* in note (4) in [X][7]. Note the reverse of this in G *dūti* for *dūtā* (see note (2) in [S]) and Y *lājine* for *lājāne* (see note (6) in[Q]).

---

[6] E. BENVENISTE, "Édits d'Aśoka en traduction grecque", in *Journal Asiatique* 252 (1964), pp. 137-57, in part. p. 142 foll.

[7] See K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10 (1967), pp. 160-70 (= CPI, pp. 47-58), p. 163.

We may assume that the original version had *mita* (== *mitta*) < *m-i-tra* (cf. the past participle *m-i-ta),* cf. AMg *metta.*

(3) K Y *taphā* Sh *tato.* K Y *taphā* (< Sanskrit *tasmāt)* must be the original eastern form, left untranslated by the scribes. Note that in [C] [F] and [K] K Y (where legible) have *tato,* i.e. a western form.

(4) The compound *bahutāvatake* is translated "many times as many" by Hultzsch[8] and "plusieurs fois ce nombre" by Bloch[9], although *bahu-* does not normally mean "many times". The Gk version has σχεδόν ἄλλοι τοσοῦτοι ἐτελεύτησαν "nearly as many others died"[10], which makes it clear that the Gk. translator took *bahu-* in the sense of "nearly, almost, rather". This meaning is found in Sanskrit, e.g. *bahutrivarṣa* "well-nigh three years old" (see MW, s.v. *bahu).* We therefore have a choice of translating *bahu-tāvataka* as "many times as many" or "almost as many", or of taking *bahu* and *tāvataka* as separate words "many, (in fact) so many" (cf. Pāli *tāvataka).*

[C] "After that, now that the inhabitants of Kaliṅga have been taken, there is ardent entry into (Sh: practice of) morality, there is love of morality, there is instruction in morality for His Majesty".

(1) K Sh M *tato* Y *tat.* G *tatā* (where *-ā* probably represents an incomplete *-o,* see note (2) in [I], note (3) in [M] and note (1) in [U]). For the western form *tato* at K see note (3) in [B]. The final vowel at Y is illegible.

(2) K Y G *pachā* Sh M *paca* <*paścāt.* The loss of aspiration in Sh M probably arises from the weak articulation of the aspirate in the north-western dialect. See note (1) in [AA], and cf. M *aaṃ* for *ahaṃ* in RE VI[L] and M *maa* for *maha* in RE V[E] and [N].

(3) Note K *kaligya* (see note (3) in [A]).

---

[8] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[9] J. BLOCH, *op. cit.,* p. 125.

[10] E. BENVENISTE, *op. cit.,* p. 139: "*à peu près autant sont mortes*".

(4) K *dhaṃmavāye* Y *dhaṃmāvāya* Sh *dhramaśilana* M
dhramavaye G *dhaṃmavāyo*. Except at Y, the second element
of the compound seems to be *vāya* < *vyāya* < *vy-ā-aya*,
"descent into, entry into". Y seems to include *avāya*; cf.
samavāya in RE XII[I][11]. Sh -*śilana* suggests either that *avāya*
was not current in the dialect and the scribe was forced to
replace it, or that the scribe did not recognise the second part of
the compound and made a guess as to its meaning.

(5) K *dhaṃmānuṣathi* Y *dhaṃmanusaṭhi* Sh M *dhramanuśasti*. We
may assume that the original version had *dhaṃmānusaṭhi* (cf.
AMg *anusaṭṭhi)*, of which the western version would be
dhaṃmānusathi. Where the compound recurs in [S] and in RE
III[C], K Y have *anusathi* and G has *anusasti*, i.e. Y replaced an
eastern form by a western one. For the occurrence of -*ṭh*- and -
sṭ-[12].

[D] "But His Majesty has remorse for his conquest of the inhabitants
of Kaliṅga".

(1) K □*ṣe* Y *se* Sh *so* "but". This is the nominative singular neuter
of the third person pronoun = Sanskrit *tad*, the sentence
connecting particle (see MW, s.v. *tad)*, but the reading *so* shows
that the scribe at Sh took the word *se* he received in his
exemplar to be masculine. See [E] and [H] (where it is used as a
correlative to the relative pronoun and Sh converts to *taṃ)*, and
[J] [K] [T] and [U]. In the eastern dialects *e* and *se* can only be
nominative, which shows that Sanskrit *yat ... tat*, and Pāli *yaṃ ...
taṃ* in comparable constructions are nominative.

(2) K *anuṣaye* Y *anusaye* Sh *anusocana* G <*anu*>*sayo* < Sanskrit
anuśaya "remorse". The occurrence of *anusocana* "regret" at Sh
suggests that the scribe there probably received *anusaye* written

---

[11] F. EDGERTON, review of BLOCH 1950, in *Journal of the American Oriental
Society* 72 (1952), p. 116 and J. BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 125, note 5.

[12] See K. R. NORMAN, "The orthography of the Girnar version of the Aśokan
Rock Edicts", in *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 5 (1987), pp. 273-85, in part. pp. 274-
77.

as *anusane* (because of the similarity of the akṣaras *ya* and *na* in Brāhmī[13]), and "restored" it as *anus<oc>ane*[14].

(3) K *vijinitu* Y *vijinit.* Sh *vijiniti.* The form at K. may be an example of the infinitive used as an absolutive, or of the weak grade of *itvā*, i.e. **-itū*. See note (4) in [S]. The form at Sh is an absolutive in *-i(t)tī* < *-itvī*.

(4) K *kaligyāni* Y *kaligāni* Sh *kaligani.* Here *-āni* is the masculine accusative plural ending.

[E] "For conquering the unconquered, when slaughter takes place there, and death and transportation of people, then it is thought of as extremely painful and thought of as serious by His Majesty".

(1) K *vijinamane* Sh *vijinamano.* For the nominative absolute construction[15].

(2) K Y *e* Sh *yo* ... K *ṣe* Y M *se* Sh *taṃ* G *ta* "when ... then". Note the use of the third person pronoun as a correlative to the relative pronoun. See note (1) in [D].

(3) I take *bādhaṃ* to be an adverbial accusative.

(4) K Y Sh M *vedaniya-* G *vedana-* . The form at G probably stands for *vedanna-* <**vedanya-*. K *-mute* Y *-ma..* Sh *-mataṃ* M *-mate* G *-mata.* K *-mute* shows the labialisation of *u* after *m* (cf. note (5) and note (2) in [P]. It seems likely that this was a feature of the original version, which was retained.

(5) K. *gulu-mute* Y *gulu-mate* Sh M G *guru-mata.* For K *-muta* see note (4).

(6) K *devānaṃpiyaṣā* Y *devānaṃpiyasa* Sh *devānaṃpriyasa* M *devanapriyasa.* These are genitive forms in the sense of

[13] K. R. NORMAN, "Studies in the epigraphy of the Aśokan inscriptions", in *Studies in Indian Epigraphy (Bhāratīya Purābhilekha Patrikā)* 2 (1975), pp. 36-41 (=CP I, pp. 214-19), in part. p. 37

[14] K. R. NORMAN, "Lexical variation in the Aśokan inscriptions", in *Transactions of the Philological Society,* 1970, pp. 121-36 (= CP I, pp. 130-43), in part. p. 134.

[15] See K. R. NORMAN, "Aśoka and capital punishment", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1975, pp. 16-24, = CP I, pp. 200-13, in part. p. 212.

instrumentals in combination with *-mata* (see note (1) in [A]). Note that Sh writes *-y-* in *-priyasa* here, as opposed to *priasa* in FA-I.

[F] "But this is thought of as more serious than that by His Majesty".

(1) KY Sh *M tato. For the western form tato at K Y see note (3) in [B].*

(2) *K galumatatale Y gulumatatale Sh gurumatataraṃ. The formation of* this is surprising. We might have expected *gurutaramata* "thought of as more serious". Note K *galu* here and in [G], in contrast to K *gulu* in [E], and G *garu-* in note (6) in [K]. It is uncertain whether this is a genuine formation based on the same grade of the stem as in Sanskrit *garīyas,* or whether it is by analogy.

[G] "Whatever brāhmaṇas live there, or śramaṇas or other sects, or householders who are well disposed, of whom there is obedience to authority, obedience to parents, obedience to elders, proper behaviour to friends, acquaintances, companions, relatives, slaves and servants, (and) firm devotion, of them there is injury there or death or separation from dear ones".

(1) *K y. tatā vasati Y e tata vasati Sh ye tatra vasati.* Note K *y(e)*, i.e. a western form here, but note K *e* in [F]; cf. K *ye* in note (12) in [X], K *yeṣaṃ Y y.saṃ* in note (1) in [H], K *yatā* in notes (2) and (6) in [J] and K *yata* in note (1) in [S]. Note that the singular verb *vasati* is constructed with plural subjects.

(2) K *eṣ.* Sh M *eṣa Y esa,* this is normally taken as a demonstrative pronoun with *agabhutiṣuṣuṣā,* etc. It makes better sense, however, if it is taken as the genitive plural of the relative pronoun (= Sanskrit *yeṣām*), constructed with the correlative K *teṣaṃ Y tesa Sh teṣa* later in the same sentence. This would seem, then, to be an eastern form which was not recognised by the scribes and consequently not translated into the appropriate western form. If this interpretation is correct, then the previous

clause must end at *vihitā,* and since *yesu vihitā* makes no sense
we must divide *ye suvihitā.* That this word-division is correct is
shown by two facts: (i) Sh and M did not regard *yesu* as a
locative plural, or they would have written *yeṣu, (ii)ye suvihitā*
is parallel to *yeṣaṃ suvihitānaṃ* in [H][16].

(3) Modern translators, not recognising *suvihita-* in this paragraph,
do not translate it, but where it occurs again in [H] Hultzsch (p.
47) translated "well provided for", as did Sircar[17]; Bloch (p.
127) translated "*les chanceux*"; and R. Thapar[18] "those who are
fortunate to have escaped". I translate "who are well disposed".
In Sanskrit *suvihita-* means "well provided with" (see MW, s.v.
suvihita-), but the Middle Indo-Aryan equivalents mean
"carrying out *vidhi* well". Jaina Prakrit *suvihiya-* is used of those
carrying out religious *vidhi* "rite" well[19], and can be translated
"pious". Pāli *suvihita-* occurs in Th 75, where it is used as a
parallel to *santa-* . "good" in a context where *ariya-* "noble" is
used elsewhere[20] and the commentary paraphrases by *ariya-*[21].
Aśoka, however, uses *vidhi* in a non-religious sense as
"instruction, order" in Pillar Edict 1[G], and *suvihita* could
therefore be translated as "carrying out the king's orders well,
considering the king's interests". This suggestion would seem to
be supported by the Gk. phrase τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
συμφέροντα νοεῖν.

(4) Bloch was tempted[22] to explain *agabhuti-* as being an abstract
noun formed by adding the suffix *-ti* to *agabhu-* (< Sanskrit
agrabhū- "being at the top, at the head of"; see MW, s.v.

---

[16] See K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", cit., p. 166.

[17] D. C. SIRCAR, *Select Inscriptions,* Vol. I, Calcutta, 1965, p. 24.

[18] R. THAPAR, *Aśoka and the decline of the Mauryas,* Oxford, 1961, p. 256.

[19] The Prakrit-Hindi dictionary *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo* states: *suvihia [suvihita]*
sundara ācaraṇa vālā, sadācārī. The *Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary* gives: *suvihiya[-*
ta] "one who observes a prescribed rite".

[20] *sādhu suvihitāna dassanaṃ ... tasmā sādhu sataṃ samāgamo.* Cf. *sādhu*
ariyānaṃ dassanaṃ, Dhp 206.

[21] *sīlādiguṇehi susaṃvihitattā bhāvānaṃ parānuddayāya suṭṭhu vihita-*
dhamma-desanānaṃ arivānam dassanaṃ sādhū ti yoianā. Th-a I 177, 24-26.

[22] J. BLOCH, *op. cit.,* p. 126 note 7

agrabhū-). It would therefore mean "the state of being in front, at the top, i.e. authority". He remarked, however, that the retroflex *-ṭ-* at Sh and M precluded this. If *bhuti-* stands for *-bhṛti-*, as Bloch suggested, we might have expected *-t-* in the eastern versions too, cf. *maṭa-* < *mṛta-, kaṭa-* < *kṛta-, bhaṭaka-* < *bhṛtaka-* at Y. I would, however, suggest that the absence of *-ṭ-* at the eastern sites does not prove that *-ṭ-* is an innovation in the north-western sites[23]. It is most unlikely that if Sh M received the same exemplar as Y K, in which there was a form with *-t-*, the scribes in the North-West would replace *-t-* with *-ṭ-*. It follows, then, that the form with *-ṭ-*, i.e. an eastern form, was in the exemplar(s) received at Sh M. Since Y K Sh and M normally follow the same recension of the REs, we should perhaps recognise an occasional sub-recension, with eastern forms sent to the North-West, but with some western forms already inserted in the versions sent to Y K (cf. Sh *anuvaṭanti* against K Y *anuvataṃti* in note (5) in [R], and Sh *vuṭa* against K Y *vuta* in note (6) in [S]). If this is so, then *bhuṭi* is a genuine eastern form, and it is to be derived < Sanskrit *bhṛti.* I assume that **agra-bhṛti* must mean «the state of being an *agrabhṛta* "a topmost servant, a high official"».

(5) Note K *galu* (for the form see note (2) in [F]). Note that Sh resolves the compound into *guruna suśruśa,* where *guruna* is a genitive plural in the sense of a dative. Cf. *-bhaṭakanaṃ* in note (7).

(6) Note K *nātikeṣu,* not *-ikyeṣu,* doubtless arising from the failure of the scribe to make the necessary dialect change of *-k-* > *-ky-* (cf. note (1) in [AA]).

(7) K *-bhaṭakaṣi* Y *-bhaṭakaṣi* Sh *-bhaṭakanaṃ,* i.e. Sh replaces the locative singular with a genitive plural. Cf. Sh *guruna* in (5).

---

[23] See K. R. NORMAN, "An Aśokan miscellany", in *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn,* Reinbek, 1994, pp. 455-73, in part. p. 469, in contrast to an earlier incorrect explanation in K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Greek version of Aśoka's Twelfth and Thirteenth Rock Edicts", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 1972, pp. 111-18 (= CP I, pp. 144-55).

(8) K *ṣamyāpaṭipati* Y *samyāpaṭipati* Sh *sammapratipati*. It would appear that the conjunct *-my-* was in the exemplars received at K. and Y. The same is true of the same phrase in RE IX[G] and RE XI[C]. The phrase was probably a *cliché*, retaining an archaic spelling.

(9) K Y *upaghāte* Sh *apagratho* (the initial *-a-* is doubtful). The word at Sh is probably from *grath-* "to injure" (cf. Kośa *grathita* < *granth-* "injured"). It is possible that the exemplar received at Sh contained *upaghatha,* with assimilation of the aspirates, and the scribe wrote *-gratho* because he thought he recognised the root *grath-* "to injure"; cf. Kośa *grathita* "injured". Cf. note (8) in [H] where the scribe wrote *apaghratha,* the initial *a-* seems certain there.

[H] "Those well disposed ones, whose affection is undiminished, when their friends, acquaintances, companions and relatives come to disaster there, then it is an injury for them indeed".

(1) K *yeṣaṃ* Y *y.saṃ* Sh *yeṣa* M *yeṣaṃ* G *yesaṃ*. For the western *y-* at K Y, see note (l) in [G].

(2) K *śinehe* Y M *sinehe* Sh *siho*. The scribe at Sh omitted the akṣara *ne* from *sineho*.

(3) K Y *e tānaṃ* Sh *e teṣa* M *e tan..* Hultzsch prints thus, but Bloch prints as one word, on the grounds that *e* would be an eastern form in the North-West. I think that Bloch was right to raise an objection (p. 127 note 9), but I think that his reasoning was wrong. I agree with Hultzsch that *e* is a relative pronoun, but I think that the fact that Sh and M did not write initial *y-* proves that they did not recognise it as an eastern form of the relative pronoun, but wrongly took *eta-* as the demonstrative pronoun.

(4) K *ṣe* Y *se* Sh *taṃ* G *so*, I believe that this is the correlative constructed with *e* "when ... then". See note (1) in [D].

(5) K *-nātikya* Y *-natike* Sh *-ñatika* G *-ñātikā*, i.e. we have a dvandva compound at Y in the singular (presumably neuter), expressing categories. This explains the singular verb. G (and

probably the other sites also) replaced this with a nominative plural form.

(6) G *vyasanaṃ* Sh *vasana* K *viyaṣanaṃ,* Y *viyasanaṃ,* i.e. it is accusative – the nominative would end in *-e* – and must be the object of *pāpunāti.* Note that in K *pāpunāta* the *i-mātrā* has been omitted from the *ta* akṣara.

(7) K *evā* Y *eva* Sh *vo.* For *vo* used repeatedly as an emphatic particle at Sh, see RE 1[G], III[C], IV[A], IX[J] [K], XII[I], XIV[A].

(8) Sh *apaghratha.* Cf. *apagratha* in note (9) in [G]. The initial *a-* is certain, but it may have been written because the proceeding *vo* creates a phonetic ambience which makes writing initial *u-* unnecessary.

[I] "And this is bad fortune for all men, and it is thought of as serious by His Majesty".

(1) K Y *paṭibhāge* Sh *pratibhagaṃ* G *paṭībhāgo.* As in note (5) in [K], Sh takes *-bhāga* to be neuter, and G takes it as masculine. The translations offered for *paṭibhāga-* have differed widely. Hultzsch translated (p. 24) "this is shared by all men"; Sircar[24] "this fate is shared"; Bloch (p. 127) "participation"; but Woolner[25] quoted translations such as "diffused misery" and "violence". Sanskrit *bhāga-* means "share, lot, fortune" and in the early texts especially "good fortune"; Sanskrit *pratibhāga* also means "share, portion" (see MW, s.vv. *bhāga-* and *pratibhāga-).* The prefix *prati-* means "against, counter", and in compounds it occasionally has the meaning "contrary to", e.g. *prati-kāmin-* "contrary to desire, disagreeable" (see MW, s.v. *pratikāmin-).* If *paṭi-* has this meaning here, then *paṭibhāga-* could mean "contrary to good fortune", i.e. "bad fortune".

---

[24] D. C. SIRCAR, *op. cit.,* p. 24.
[25] A. C. WOOLNER, *Aśoka Text and Glossary,* Part II, Calcutta, 1924, s.v. *paṭibhāge.*

(2) K *ca eṣa* Y *ca se* Sh *etaṃ* M *eṣa* G *c'esā* (where *-a* is an incomplete *-o,* see note (1) in [C]). We may assume that the original version had *ca ese,* where *ese* was neuter, but was misunderstood by the scribe at G.

[J] "But that country does not exist where these classes, the brāhmaṇas and the śramaṇas, do not exist, except among the Greeks, and there is nowhere in any country where there is not faith of men in one sect or other".

(1) K *cā* Y Sh M ca "but". See note (1) in [D].

(2) K *yatā* Y *ata* M *yatra.* Note the western form with initial *y-* at K; see note (6) and note (1) in [G].

(3) Note that the plural *nikāyā* is followed by singular nouns – "these classes: the brāhmaṇa and the śramaṇa". For collective singular nouns cf. *aṭavi* (see note (1) in [M] and *yutā: rajuke pādesike* in RE III[C].

(4) K *baṃhmane* Y *bābhane* M *bramaṇe.* At K *baṃhmane* is probably a mistake for *bāhmane,* with *-aṃ* written for *-ā.* The confusion of *-aṃ* and *-ā* is not uncommon (cf. note (5), note (2) in [W] and note (8) in [X]). It doubtless arises from the writing of an anusvāra so close to the preceding akṣara that it resembles an *ā*-mātrā, or from an *ā*-mātrā written carelessly so that it does not touch the preceding *akṣara* and therefore looks like an anusvāra[26].

(5) K *ānatā* Y *aṃnatā* M *añatra* G *añatra.* K *ānatā* < *aṃnatā* shows *ā* for *aṃ,* cf. note (4). For *yonesu* note Sircar's quotation from Pāli[27]: *Yona-Kambojesu ... dve va vaṇṇā: ayyo c' eva dāso ca* (M II 149, 4-6).

(6) K *yatā* Y *ata* Sh G *yatra.* Note the western form with initial *y-* at K; see note (1) and note (1) in [G].

---

[26] See K. R. NORMAN, "Aśokan inscriptions from Sannati", cit., p. 109.
[27] D. C. SIRCAR, *op. cit.,* p. 35 note 8.

[K] "Therefore however many people then, when the inhabitants of Kaliṅga were taken, were killed and died and were transported, one hundredth part, one thousandth part of that is today thought of as serious by His Majesty".

(1) K *ṣe* Y M *se* Sh *so* "therefore". See note (1) in [D].
(2) K *avatake* Y *āvatake* G *yāvatako* Sh *yamatro*. It is not obvious why Sh does not have *yavataka,* since *(bahu)-tavatake* occurs at Sh in [B]. Perhaps **yavata* was received without *-ka,* and changed to *yamata* (with the common change of *-v-* > *-m-*) and was interpreted as *ya(m)-matra*; alternatively, perhaps *yamatake* was received (with the change of *-v-* > *-m-* already made), was assumed to be the equivalent of *yam-mātraka* and *ka* was omitted to fit in with *matra* in [B][28].
(3) Note K *kaliṃga* here. Presumably the presence of *-ṃ-* prevented the change of *-g-* > *-gy-*. Contrast [A] [C] and[D].
(4) K Sh M *tato*. Y is illegible at this point. For the western form *tato* at K see note (3) in [B].
(5) K. *ṣatebhāge ṣahaṣabhāge* Y *satabhāge sahasabhāge* Sh *śatabhage sahasrabhagaṃ* M *śatabhage sahasrabhage* G *...srabhāgo* "one hundredth part, one thousandth part". The reading *śate bhāge* at K perhaps arose from the scribe thinking (wrongly) that *sata* and *bhāga* were separate words in agreement. The scribe at Sh decided that he should write the ending *-aṃ* for the second *-bhāga,* taking it as neuter, but he did not correct the first, which remained as *-e*. G *-bhāgo* shows that the scribe there decided that the *-bhāge* he received in his exemplar was masculine. See note (1) in [I]. Cf. G *-mato* in note (6).
(6) K *gulumate* Y *-mate* Sh *gurumataṃ* M *gurumate* G *garumato*. For the masculine ending *-o* in G *-mato,* cf. *-bhāgo* in note (5). Note G *garu-,* and cf. K *galu-* in note (2) in [F].

---

[28] See K. R. NORMAN, "Lexical variation in the Aśokan inscriptions", cit., pp. 130-31.

[L] "Should anyone injure (him), what can be forgiven is indeed thought fit to be forgiven by His Majesty".

(1) Y *e pi aja apahaleya* Sh *yo pi ca apakareyati*. The verb at Sh seems to be an optative with a primary ending; cf. Sh *nivaṭeyati* in RE IX[J]; cf. K *ṣiyāti-ti* M *siyati-ti-*in-RE X[C].

(2) Y ... *sakiye khamitave* Sh *yaṃ śako ch'amanaye* G *ya sak. chamitave*. Note that Y and G have infinitives, and Sh has the dative of purpose of an *-ana* stem noun, which serves as the equivalent of an infinitive. I assume that Sh *śako* is a mistake, arising from the scribe's belief that it should agree with *yo*. I think it should be neuter, agreeing with *yam*. For Sanskrit *śakya* with an infinitive in a passive sense "able to be forgiven", see MW, s.v. *śakya*.

(3) The *na* which precedes *ya* at G is presumably the final syllable of *devānaṃpriyena*, although elsewhere in constructions with *-mata* G has agreed with other sites in having a genitive form *-priyasa'*, see note (1) in [A].

[M] "And the forest dwellers in His Majesty's territory, even on them he has compassion, and wins them over".

(1) Y Sh M *aṭavi* G *aṭaviyo*. Here *aṭavi* "the forest" is used as a collective singular in the sense of "the forest dwellers". We may assume that the scribe at G realised this, but perhaps objected to the use of such singulars (cf. G *paṭivesiyehi* where the other versions have *-ena* in RE XI[D]). He therefore wrote the plural *aṭaviyo*.

(2) G *pijite* for *vijite*. The writing of *p* for *v* would seem to be a mistake.

(3) G *pāti* for *bhoti* (with *-ā* as a partial writing of *-o*; cf. note (1) in [C]). The writing of *p* for *bh* would seem to be a mistake.

[N] "And remorse is said to them by His Majesty to be the cause, in order that they may repent and may not kill".

(1) Y *anutāpe pi ca pabhāve* Sh M *anutape pi ca prabhave.* His Majesty's remorse (for the killings he has committed) is said to be the cause of his compassion towards them.

(2) Note *kiti = kiṃti* "in order that", constructed with the optative. It is constructed with the negative injunctive in [X][29].

(3) Y *avatapeyu* Sh *avatrapeyu* "they may be ashamed, may repent"; < Sanskrit *apatrap-* with the change of *-p- > -v-.*

(4) Y *haṃneyu* K *..neyu* Sh *haṃñeyasu.* This may be interpreted as "may kill" or "may be killed". In RE I[G] Sh *haṃñaṃti* is certainly passive[30]. For the Sh optative ending *-eyasu,* cf. Sh *siyasu* in RE XII[J].

[O] "For His Majesty wishes for all creatures freedom from injury, self restraint, impartiality and gentleness".

(1) Y *achati* Sh *ach'ati* G *achatiṃ* < Sanskrit *akṣati.* Note the western development of *kṣ > (c)ch* at Y.

(2) Note that the scribe at G inserted *ca ... ca ... ca,* doubtless for stylistic reasons, as he did in RE III[C].

(3) Y *sāmacaliyaṃ* Sh *samacaritaṃ* G *samacairaṃ.* G *-caira* is presumably the scribe's way of writing *-cera,* cf. Prakrit *bambhacera.* For other examples of the writing of the *ai-mātrā* at G, cf. *thaira-* in RE IV[C], RE V[L] and RE VIII[E], and *traidasa-* in RE V[I]. Cf. *mai* at Brahmagiri, where Hultzsch[31] suggested reading *me.* The fact that Sh has *sama-* shows that the scribe assumed the word was derived from Sanskrit *sama-* "level, impartial" rather than from *śama -* "peace". For Gāndhārī *sama 'irya,* also showing *s-* rather than *ś-*[32].

---

[29] See K. R. NORMAN, "Pāli lexicographical studies IX", in *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16 (1992), pp. 77-85 (= CP V, pp. 71-79), in part. pp. 77-80.

[30] But for the interpretation as an active verb here see C. CAILLAT, "Aśoka et les gens de la brousse", in *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 9 (1991), pp. 9-13, and K. R. NORMAN, "An Aśokan miscellany",cit., pp. 462-64.

[31] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.,* pp. 171-80 (= CP I, pp. 170-80), in part.p. 176 note 7.

[32] See K. R. NORMAN, "The Gāndhārī version of the Dharmapada", in *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Homer,* Dordrecht, 1974, p. 172.

(4) Y G *mādavaṃ* K *madava* Sh *rabhasiye*. Y G *mādavaṃ* (with *mād-* not *mad(d)-* < *mārdava* "gentleness") must be accusative, but Sh *rabhasiye* is presumably locative "in the event of violence". Cf. Sanskrit *rābhasya* "velocity, impetuosity" (Dhātup); "delight, joy, pleasure" (see MW, s.v. *rābhasya)*. The Sh scribe possibly thought the word he received in his exemplar was connected with *mardana*.

[P] "But this is thought to be the best victory by His Majesty, namely the victory of morality".

(1) K *vu* Y *cu* Sh *ca* "but". K *vu* for *cu* shows the common mis-writing of *v* for *c*; cf. note (1) in [V][33].
(2) Y *mokhyā*... Sh *mukhamut*.. M *mukhamute*. For the labialisation of *-a-* to *-u-* after *-m-*, see note (4) in (Ē].

[Q] "But this has been obtained by His Majesty here and at all the boundaries, up to 600 *yojanas* (from here), where the Greek king Antiochus is, and beyond that Antiochus four kings, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas and Alexander, constantly, the Coḷas and the Pāṇḍyas as far as Tambapaṇṇi".

(1) K *punā* Sh M *puna* Y *mana* "but". The form at Y is < *pana*. Since *pana* is an enclitic, *p-* is treated as intervocalic and changed > *v-* and then > *m-* in proximity to another nasal (-n-).
(2) Y *hida* .. *bā* .....*ū ca aṃtesu*. If Y *bā* is the remains of *bāhiresu*, this suggests that the scribe began to insert something to make a contrast to *hida* "here". Cf. Y *hidā ca bāhilesu ca nagalesu* in RE V[M], where G wrote *pāṭalipute* instead of *hida*, presumably realising that *hida* did not refer to Girnār.
(3) K Sh M *a* Y *ā*. Here Y *ā* may mean "up to", cf. Pāli *ā sahassehi pañcahi* Ja VI 192,19* (commentary: *yāva sahassehi),* cf. note (11) and see CPD s.v. [2]*ā.* Alternatively, it may be the relative

---

pronoun *yā* referring to *aṃtā* "boundaries which are at ... ". There is the same uncertainty about G *ā Taṃbapaṃnī* RE II[A]. K Sh M *a* may be either of these, or may stand for *yaṃ* "namely"; cf. Sanskrit *yad* (see MW, s.v. *yad).*

(4) K *ata* Sh *yatra,* i.e. K retains the eastern form without initial *y-.*

(5) Y *catā...* K *catāli* (the neuter used for the masculine, with weakening of the final *-e > -i* [cf. Sh *rajani* and Sh *duvi* in RE [G] and RE II[A]) Sh *cature* (accusative used for nominative) G *catpāro* (= masculine nominative plural). K and Sh write the numeral 4.

(6) K *lajāne* Y *lājine* Sh *rajani.* For the weakening of the final vowel, cf. K *catāli* in note (7). Y *lājine* shows the writing of an *i-mātrā* in mistake for an *ā-mātrā*; see note (2) in [B].

(7) K *tulamaye* Sh *turamaye* G *turamāyo.* For the hyper-form converting an original *l > r* at G, cf. *phara* and *maṃgara* in RE IX at Sopārā[34].

(8) Note G *ca... ca... ca* where the other sites have *nāma* three times.

(9) K Sh M *nica(ṃ)* Y *nitiyaṃ*, K *nicaṃ* must be a western form which was already in the exemplar received there. We might surmise that the words *dūtā devānaṃpiyasa yaṃti* have been omitted from the sentence by mistake. There is probably a contrast between where the messengers go permanently, and where they do not go permanently, as specified in [S][35].

(10) K Sh M *coḍa-* Y *coḍā.* Y has split up the *dvandva* compound into two separate nominative plural forms.

(11) Y *ā* K *āvaṃ* Sh *ava* M *a* "as far as"; is Y a M *a* a mistake for *āva* (*<yāvat*) or an example of *ā* with the ablative case (see note (3), in which case *āva* may be *ā* followed by the particle *va.*

---

[34] See K. R. NORMAN, "Some aspects of the phonology of the Prakrit underlying the Aśokan inscriptions", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33 (1970), pp. 132-43 (CP I, pp. 93-107), in part. p. 138.

[35] See K. R. NORMAN, "An Aśokan miscellany", cit., p. 459.

[R] "In the same way here in the territory of the king, among the Greeks and Kambojas, the Nabhakas and Nabhapantis, the Bhojas and Pitinikas, the Andhras and Pālandas, everywhere they conform to His Majesty's instruction in morality".

(1) For G *visaya,* the other sites have forms with -*v*-; cf. the variation between -*y*- and -*v*- in the 3 plural optative ending, e.g. K *vasevu* G *vaseyu* in RE VII[A].

(2) K -*kambojeṣu* Y -*kambocesu* Sh -*kamboyeṣu* M G -*kambo...*; for Sh *y* for *j* (usually after a long vowel) see Bloch (p. 53, §11). Note, however, *prayuhotave* in RE I[B].

(3) K *nābhapaṃtiṣu* Sh *nabhitina* M *nabhapaṃtiṣu.* Sh *nabhitina* is probably due to a mistaken copying of -*itin*- from *bhoja-pitinikeṣu.*

(4) K -*pāladeṣu* Y -*pāladesu* Sh -*palideṣu* G -*pāriṃdesu.* Since *pālada,* etc., is in compound with *a(ṃ)dha,* etc., it is probable that both peoples lived in the South of India, and were unknown in the West. If this were so, then the scribes in the West and North-West would have to guess at the correct form of the name in their dialects, and they perhaps saw a connection with Sanskrit *pārīndra,* as Hultzsch suggested[36].

(5) K Y *anuvataṃti* Sh *anuvaṭaṃti* G *anuvatare.* The retroflex -*ṭ*- is probably not an innovation at Sh, but is an eastern form retained from the exemplar (see note (4) in [G]).

[S] "Even where His Majesty's messengers do not go, they too having heard of His Majesty's practice of morality (and) order (and) instruction in morality, conform to morality and will conform to it".

(1) K Sh M G *yata* Y *ata.* Note the western form with initial *y*- at K, and see note (1) in [G].

(2) Note G *dūti,* with -*i* written for -*ā*; see note (2) in [B].

(3) K Y M *yaṃti* Sh *vrachaṃti.*

---

[36] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.,* p. 48 note 14.

(4) K Y *sutu* Sh M *śrutu*. The vowel -*u*- in the stem suggests that we have a weak grade form of the absolutive ending i.e. **śru-tū*, rather than an infinitive < *śrotum*, which would have the guṇa grade vowel -*o*-. Cf. K *vijinitu* in note (3) in [D].

(5) Note K -*pinaṃya* with -*n*- written for -*y*- (for the confusion of *na* and *ya* in the Brāhmī script[37], and cf. K. -*pine* in note (3) in [W] and K *no* in note (6) in [X]). For -*y*- written for -*s*- because of the similarity in shape[38]). For the writing of an unhistoric *anusvāra* by mistake, cf. K -*aṃti* in note (4) in [W].

(6) K Y *dhaṃmavutaṃ* Sh *dhramavuṭaṃ* M *dhramavuta*. The presence of -*t*- at K Y might suggest that *vuta* is perhaps < Sanskrit *ukta*, with -*ṭ*- arising from a wrong backformation at Sh, but this seems unlikely. I assume that it is derived < Sanskrit *vṛtta*. See note (4) in [G].

(7) K *dhaṃmānusathi* Sh M *dhramanuśasti* G *dhaṃmānusasṭiṃ*. See note (5) in [C].

(8) K *anuvidhiyaṃa anuvidhiyisaṃa* Y *anuvidhiyi.. anuvidhiyisaṃti* Sh M *anuvidhiyaṃti anuvidhiyiśaṃti* G *anuvidhiyare*. K -*aṃa* (twice) is a mistake for -*aṃti*, and is due to the similarity between initial *a* and *ti* in the Brāhmī script[39].

(9) K *cā ye* Y *ceva* Sh *ca yo* M *ca ye*. Y *ceva* shows that we must take *ye* and *yo* as emphatic particles belonging to [S]. The first word of [T] is therefore K Y M *se* Sh *sa*. for *ye* as an emphatic particle[40].

[T] "But victory obtained by such (peaceful means) is a victory everywhere; moreover a victory everywhere has a taste of joy".

(1) K YM *se* Sh *sa* "but". See note (1) in [D].

(2) Sentence [T] ends with *pīti-raso,* and K Y *se* Sh *so* G *sā* belong to [U].

---

[37] See K. R. NORMAN, "Studies in the epigraphy of the Aśokan inscriptions", cit., p. 37.

[38] *Ibid,* p. 38

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] See K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", cit., p. 162.

[U] "That joy has been obtained (by me) in the morality victory".

(1) The first word of the sentence is K Y *se* Sh *so* G *sā* "but, now" (see note (1) in [D]). G *sā* is a partial writing for (the incorrect) *so,* see note (1) in [C].

(2) K *gadhā* Y G *ladhā* Sh *ladha,* if K *gadhā* is authentic, it is < **grabdha* < **grabh-ta.* It may be by analogy with *laddha,* because of the similarity of the meaning of the roots *labh* and *gabh.* If it is a mistake, it is perhaps due to a strange form of *la,* cf. the V-shape of *la* in Minor RE I at Bahapur[41], which was mistaken for an inverted *ga*[42].

[V] "But that joy is indeed small".

(1) K *vu* Y *cu* Sh *tu* "but". For K *vu* as a mistake for *cu,* see note (1) in [P].

[W] "His Majesty thinks that only that which concerns the next world has great fruit".

(1) K *pālaṃtikyaṃ eve* Y *palatikaṃm eva* Sh M *paratrikam eva,* cf. Sanskrit *pāratrika* "belonging to the next world". For the insertion of *ṃ* at K, cf. K *pālaṃtikyāye* in RE X[C]). For the nasalisation of *-aṃ* > *-aṃm* at Y, cf. *taṃm* in note (10) in [X][43].

(2) Note K *-phalā* for *-phalaṃ,* showing the writing of *-ā* for *-aṃ.* See note (4) in [J].

---

[41] See M. C. JOSHI, B. M. PANDE, "A newly discovered inscription of Aśoka at Bahapur", in JRAS, 1967, pp. 96-98, in part. p. 97; K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Bahapur version of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 1971, pp. 41-43 (= CP I, pp. 108-12), in part. pp. 41-42.

[42] See K. R. NORMAN, "Lexical variation in the Aśokan inscriptions", cit., p. 135.

[43] See K. R. NORMAN, "The nasalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan", in *Philosophy, Grammar and Indology (Essays in Honour of Professor Gustav Roth),* Delhi, 1992, pp. 331-38, in part. p. 331.

(3) Note K -*pine* for -*piye* (for the confusion of the akṣaras *na* and *ya* in the Brāhmī script; see note (5) in [S]).

(4) K *maṃnaṃti* Y *maṃnati* Sh *meñati* M *maṇati*. For the palatalisation of -*a*- > -*e*- before *ña* in Sh *meñati*, see Brough[44], § 22a [p. 81], and contrast *mañati* in [X]. The *anusvāra* in the ending -*aṃti* at K seems clear on the plate[45], but it must be a mistake. Cf. note (5) in [S].

[X] "For this purpose this rescript on morality has been written, in order that my sons and grandsons should not think that another new victory is to be won. Let them approve of mildness and light punishment in (the event of) their own victory. Let them think that that alone is a victory which is a morality victory".

(1) K Y Sh M *kiti* = *kiṃti* "in order that". It is constructed here with a negative injunctive; cf. the construction with an optative in [N].

(2) K Sh M *asu* Y *aṃnaṃ*. Alsdorf[46] reads *aṃnaṃ* in all versions. I earlier suggested[47] that *me asu* stands for *m'e= me ye asu* "(sons) who may be (born) to me", but I now withdraw that suggestion.

(3) Y *vijetaviyaṃ* G *vijetavyaṃ* K *vijay(i)taviya* Sh *vijetavia* M ...*taviyaṃ*. Note that Sh omits -*y*- in the suffix; cf. note (1) in [A].

(4) Y *maṃnisu* K *maniṣu* Sh *mañiṣu* M *maṇiṣu* G *maṃñāsara*. Hultzsch[48] regarded G *maṃñā* as a subjunctive, followed by *sara*, but *maṃñāsara* is a mistake for *maṃñisara* (with -*ā* as a partial writing of -*i*; see note (2) in [B]). It is the aorist 3 plural middle in a negative injunctive construction, where the other

[44] J. BROUGH, *The Gandharī Dharmapada*, London, 1962.

[45] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.*, facing p. 50.

[46] L. ALSDORF, "Der Schluss von Aśokas Dreizehntem Felsedikt", in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris, 1968, p. pp. 23-33, in part. 26.

[47] K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", cit., p. 166.

[48] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.*, p. lxvii.

sites have active verbs. For the secondary suffix *-ara* at G, cf. the primary suffix *-are,* the optative suffix *-era,* and the imperative suffix *-aram.*

(5) K *ṣayakaṣi* Y *sayakasi* Sh *spakaspi* M *saya* G *sake.* The original version must have had *sayaka-* < *svaya + ka.* Sh and G changed it to *saka* < *svaka,* possibly because *svayaka* is not attested in Sanskrit. For *saya* note *hitvā sayaṃ* at Ja VI 414, 27* (commentary: *sayan ti sakaraṭṭhaṃ).* M *saya* may be < *saka* (with the change of *-k- > -y-)* or it may show the omission of *-ka* from *sayaka.* The former explanation is more likely, given the lack of evidence for the change *-k- > -y-* at M.

(6) K *no* Sh *yo* Y *yeva* G *eva,* these are all emphatic particles. K *no* is perhaps a mistake for *yo* (*no* as an emphatic particle occurs only here in Aśoka, but it is found in Pāli). For the writing of *na* for *ya* see note (5) in [S]. For *yo* as an emphatic particle, cf. note (10)[49].

(7) K *khaṃti* Y *khaṃtī* Sh *ch'aṃti* G *chāti.* These are accusative forms, the object of *locayaṃtu.* Cf. note (8).

(8) K *lahudaṃdatā* Y *lahudaṃdataṃ* Sh *lahudaṃdata.* These are accusative forms, the object of *locayaṃtu,* with K *-ā* for *-aṃ,* cf. note (4) in [J].

(9) K *locetu* Y *locayaṃtu* Sh *rocetu.* The verb (< Sanskrit *rocayati)* is plural, with the anusvāra not written in the ending at K Sh, and the subject is *putā papotā;* cf. note (11). Here Sh writes the appropriate western *r* in *roc-.* In RE IV[J] and RE XIV[E], however, Sh retains eastern *l* from the exemplar.

(10) K *taṃ eva cā* Y *taṃm eva ca* Sh *taṃ ca yo.* Sh *yo* must be the emphatic particle (see note (6)), with the word order changed. Y *taṃm* shows the nasalisation of *-aṃ > -aṃm,* cf. Y *palatikaṃm* in note (1) in [W]).

(11) K *manatu* Y *maṃnaṃtu* Sh *mañatu.* The verb is plural, with the anusvāra not written in the ending at K Sh, and the subject is

---

[49] See also K. R. NORMAN, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", pp. 161-63

putā papotā, cf. note (9). Note that Sh has *mañati* here, not *meñati* as in [W].

(12) K *ye* Y *e* Sh *yo.* For the western *y-* in the relative pronoun at K, see note (1) in [G].

[Y] "That concerns this world and the next world".

(1) Y reads *se hi hida-.* K and Sh do not have *hi,* which is perhaps copied in error from [AA].

(2) Sh M G have case endings on *hidalokika,* and G inserts *ca* to make it clear that there are two separate words. Y reads *hidalokika,* i.e. a compound, which explains the lack of *ca*; K *hidalokikya* agrees with this. Cf. note (1) in [AA], where G divides the compound, adds a case ending to *ilokikā* and inserts *ca... ca.* M *-loke* shows the omission of *-ik-* by the scribe.

(3) K writes *palalokiye* not *-lokikye,* i.e. the scribe writes *-y-* instead of *-ky-,* presumably omitting the cross-stroke of *-k-.* There is no need to assume the omission of *-ik-* as Bloch does[50].

[Z] "And let all joy be joy in morality".

(1) K *savā* Y *sāva* Sh M *sava.* It would appear that the scribe at Y wrote *sāva* in error for *savā.*

(2) K *ca kani* Y *ca kāni* Sh *ca ti* M *ca kani.* We have here *ca kāni* (see RE IV[F]), although *ka* has been omitted at Sh. It is not necessary to follow Hultzsch and Bloch[51] in reading *kaṃ* at K. Sh *ti* for *ni* is a mistake based upon an exemplar written in Brāhmī script, where *ta* and *na* can be confused[52]. Hultzsch's translation "pleasure in the abandonment"[53] is based upon the belief that Sh *cati* is the correct reading. The division of the

---

[50] J. BLOCH, *op. cit.,* p. 132.

[51] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.,* p. 46, note 23; J. BLOCH, *op. cit.,* p. 132.

[52] See K. R. NORMAN, "Studies in the epigraphy of the Aśokan inscriptions", cit., p. 38.

[53] E. HULTZSCH, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

akṣaras by modern editors has masked the fact that we are dealing here with *rati*.

(3) K *hotu uyāmalati* arises from the omission of the *akṣara dhaṃ*. The correct reading *hotu yā <dhaṃ>ma-lati* was "corrected" into *hotu ayāma-lati*, by a scribe who assumed that *hotuyā* stood for *hotūyā < hotu uyā*[54].

[AA] "For that concerns this world and the next world".

(1) K Y Sh *hidalokika-* M *ialokika-* G *ilokikā*. The scribe at G split up the compound, added a case ending to *ilokikā* and inserted *ca ... ca*, cf. note (2) in [Y]. For the initial *i-* of *ilokika*, cf. G *iloka* in RE XI[E] and Sanskrit *i-tara, i-tas*, etc. For M *i-a*, cf. Sanskrit *kva < *ku-a*. It might alternatively be regarded as the omission of *h* from *iha*, because of its weak articulation (cf. note (2) in [C]). Note that K reads *hidalokika* not *-lokikya*, i.e. the scribe wrote the *-k-* he received in his exemplar, and did not change it to *-ky-*. Cf. note (6) in [G].

Conclusions

The information which we can deduce from this edict falls into two parts: philological and socio-political.

(1) From the philological point of view, we can see that, although the Y version probably retains more of the original eastern features than any other, it nevertheless includes some western features, and K has more. Conversely, the north-western sites sometimes have eastern features. Some of these anomalous features were probably found in the exemplars and left untranslated, but others seem to have been introduced indiscriminately, either by the members of the secretariat who were responsible for the various

---

[54] See K. R. NORMAN, "Lexical variation in the Aśokan inscriptions", cit., p. 133.

exemplars, or by the local scribes. The former suggestion would seem more likely, and we may assume that members of the secretariat carelessly let features of their own dialects intrude into the exemplars they were preparing for dispatch to the various sites.

(2) From the socio-political point of view, we see that in this edict Aśoka explains how, after the victory in Kaliṅga, with all the death and suffering this involved, he had a great desire for morality *(dhamma)* [C]. It pained Aśoka that those who did conform with his morality, including brāhmaṇas and śramaṇas [J], suffered nevertheless [G]. His hope for the forest dwellers is that they too (like him) may repent (of past killing) and not kill (in the future) [M-N]. What he now wished for was a morality victory, and this consisted of security for all creatures, self-restraint, impartiality and gentleness [O]. Messengers *(dūtas)* were sent to preach this everywhere, including the Greek kingdoms to the West [Q]. His conquest by morality was promulgated in the hope that his successors would not think of another (military) victory, by force of arms which would entail slaughter. In any victory they gained there should be mildness *(khaṃti)* and light punishment *(lahudaṇḍatā)* [X], unlike his own victory, with its terrible consequences, in Kaliṅga.

It seems to me quite certain, therefore, that the messengers who were sent to the Greek kings were not charged with the propagation of Buddhism, as some scholars have proposed. It would seem clear that they were sent in an attempt to persuade the rulers, probably despotic rulers, of the neighbouring states that they too should give up their desire for conquest (perhaps – we may suspect – of parts of Aśoka's territory) by war, and should try to institute the reign of security, self-restraint, impartiality and gentleness, based upon the principles of Aśoka's *dhamma*. In these circumstances, to talk, as some do, about the Aśokan missionary expansion of Buddhism among the Greeks, seems to me to be a mistake. Certainly we have no evidence from the Greek side which indicates that any Buddhist missionaries had arrived among them c. 250 B.C.E.

Modern scholars who have heard that Aśoka recommended certain *suttas,* i.e. portions of the Buddhist *dhamma,* and know that Aśoka set up *dhamma*-writings and sent out messengers, have put the two pieces of information together, and have assumed that Aśoka set up, i.e. popularised, Buddhist teachings and sent out Buddhist missionaries, although the Pāli texts (e.g. Mhv XII. 1-8) clearly state that they were sent out by Moggaliputta.